



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/995,704

11/29/2001

Jong Won Seok

P67356US0

2611

43569

7590

11/03/2005

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP  
1909 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/995,704

Applicant(s)

SEOK ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew T. Henning

Art Unit

2131

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: NONE.  
Claim(s) objected to: NONE.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Matthew T. Henning*  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2131  
10/31/05

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 8 has been amended to recite "generating a prediction coefficient based on the original audio signal" which is not the same scope as "generating a prediction coefficient of the original audio signal" and therefore would require further consideration .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicants' argument that because the PN signal is multiplied it is not only delayed, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. The claims do not recite that the PN signal is "only delayed" and nothing else. In Lee, the multiplier would delay the PN signal, and therefore meets the limitation. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Regarding applicants' argument that in the interpretation of Lee by the examiner the PN signal is "the original signal" the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. The claim recites 'a delayed original audio signal'. The PN signal is "a original audio signal" separate from "the original audio signal" of line 1 of the claim. The claim does not require the delayed audio signal be derived from the first original audio signal. If the applicants' had meant to limit the delayed signal to a delayed version of the original audio signal, as opposed to a delayed version of an original audio signal, the limitation should have been clearly specified in the claims. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Regarding applicants' argument that "the Examiner alleges that Hannigan teach the linear prediction analysis means recited in claim 1" the examiner does not find this argument persuasive. This is due to the fact that the examiner has not alleged this but instead alleged that Hannigan in view of Hayashi met the limitations of claims 9-14. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Regarding the applicants' argument that Hannigan did not disclose linear prediction analysis of the watermarked signal, the examiner has considered the argument and does not find the argument persuasive. Hannigan Col. 13 Lines 9-13 clearly disclosed computing for each sample an estimate of the original sample value, which meets the limitation of "generating a prediction coefficient" and therefore meets the limitation of the claim. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Because the examiner has not found the arguments persuasive, the examiner has maintained the final rejection presented in the final action dated 8/26/2005.